



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,299	07/31/2003	Kazuyoshi Kishibata	35985	3684
116	7590	06/05/2006	EXAMINER	
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			PARRIES, DRU M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EJL

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/632,299	Applicant(s) KISHIBATA ET AL.	
	Examiner Dru M. Parries	Art Unit 2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 24, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the argument that including "Walter nor Rashid teach that the size of the first generation coil may be reduced..." is moot because that limitation was never positively recited in the claims. The Examiner would like to note that nowhere in the claim language was there a mention of the reduction of size of a generation coil, therefore all of these arguments are moot.
2. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). This response pertains to the paragraph on page 10 of Remarks/Arguments that discusses Rashid's teachings. Admission teaches supplying power to an external load, and Walter teaches supplying power for assisting a coil when the output from one coil is short, therefore saying that Rashid doesn't teach those limitations is a moot point.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2836

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission) and Walter (6,608,401). Admission teaches two power supply systems, each using a generation coil from two different generators driven by internal combustion engines. The first system supplying DC power to loads provided in a vehicle and the second system supplying AC power to external loads (Fig. 4). Admission fails to teach a power supply circuit for assisting the first power supply system via the second supply system. Walter teaches two power supply systems (12 and 14). He also teaches a supply circuit via the second supply system for supplying a DC output having the same voltage value as the rated value of an output voltage of the first supply system to assist said first supply system (Col. 4, lines 54-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the supply circuit into Admission so that if the first generation coil's output power were to decrease or become non-existent, the second supply system could pick up the slack for it. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first generation coil generate an output necessary for driving the electrical load when the internal combustion engine, which drives the coil, exceeds a rotational speed necessary (a.k.a. the set speed) for the coil to output a necessary power.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prior Art (Admission), Walter (6,608,401), and Rashid (5,077,485). Admission teaches two power supply systems, each using a generation coil from generators driven by internal combustion engines. The first system supplying DC power to loads provided in a vehicle and the second system supplying AC power to external loads (Fig. 4). Admission fails to teach a power supply circuit for assisting the first power supply system via the second supply system, and the generation coils being from the same generator. Walter teaches two power supply systems (12 and 14). He also

Art Unit: 2836

teaches a supply circuit via the second supply system for supplying a DC output having the same voltage value as the rated value of an output voltage of the first supply system to assist said first supply system (Col. 4, lines 54-65). Rashid teaches one generator (34) with two different generation coils (40 and 46), each as their own power supply system to supply to loads (Fig. 3; Col. 5, lines 16-18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Walter's circuit into Admission so that if the first generation coil's output power were to decrease or become non-existent, the second supply system could pick up the slack for it. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have both generation coils coming from the same generator because it will save on space and cost, only needing one generator instead of two. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first generation coil generate an output necessary for driving the electrical load when the internal combustion engine, which drives the coil, exceeds a rotational speed necessary (a.k.a. the set speed) for the coil to output a necessary power.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3-8 are allowed. No prior art of record teaches a transfer switch that switches a second power supplies output from external loads of a vehicle to a supply line that provides power to electrical loads in a vehicle.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2836


MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dru M. Parries whose telephone number is (571) 272-8542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 8:00am to 5:00pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on 571-272-2800 x36. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DMP

5-23-2006



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800